

REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for assigning distributed computing tasks to a network of processor-based devices and logging the tasks and the processor-based device assigned to each task. Thus, the claim calls for a system in which computing tasks are distributed, yet a log is maintained of the tasks and which distributed computing devices have the tasks.

It is suggested that Levi teaches logging tasks and processor-based devices assigned to each task. Levi's tasks are not distributed computing tasks because, in Levi, there is no distributed computing. Moreover, there is no logging of tasks of any kind in Levi. The office action cites portions of Levi in columns 12 and 14. In column 12, there is an alert log and history 110. This is a log of alerts generated by agents. These alerts are not tasks and they are not distributed computing tasks. All there is is a logging function, which is totally inapplicable to the logging claimed.

Similarly, in column 14, there is a cite alert log and history which allows the administrator to view and modify alerts generated by devices 30 associated with a cite. There is no logging of tasks or processor-based devices associated with tasks.


Any old teaching of a log does not teach the claimed invention. The claimed invention is a way of implementing distributed computing wherein you keep track of who has the tasks and what they were assigned to do. This concept is nowhere suggested in the distributed computing art and a reference that just teaches a completely different type of log that does not log tasks and does not log the processor-based device assigned to the task, fails to make obvious the claimed invention. Even if one were to somehow combine the teachings, viewing and modifying alerts have nothing to do with logging tasks and the processor-based device assigned to the tasks.

Therefore, even if combined and such combination is without any asserted rationale to combine, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out. Moreover, in the absence of some asserted basis to combine the two references, a mere conclusion of obviousness is insufficient to make out a *prima facie* rejection.

Therefore, the rejection of the claims is subject to reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 2, 2005



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation